

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 29-42 are pending in this application. Claims 1-28 were previously cancelled, without prejudice, per the Preliminary Amendment filed October 6, 2006.

Claims 29-35 are being rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,279,256 (Norolof, et al., hereinafter "Norolof"). The Examiner asserts that:

The patent to Norolof et al discloses an adapter for attaching an electronic shelf label to a blister hook, with a housing (15) and with a suspension device for the pivotal mounting of the housing on a cross-strut provided on the free end of a cantilever of the blister hook, wherein the suspension device is a fork yoke (211) having prongs (side walls of 211) which are connected to the housing, the yoke which has a crossbar (271) connected to two pliable sleeves (217, 219) having a connecting web (279) in between and an opening between that extends as far as the connecting web the yoke which in open condition has free end that is adapted to be placed around the cross-strut and to be snap-locked onto the yoke, wherein each pliable sleeve has on its free end a hook (273) adapted for locking engagement with a mating hook (245) on the yoke. (Office Action, dated July 7, 2008, p. 2)

However Applicants respectfully disagree for the following reasons.

As shown in Figs. 7a-7c of Norolof, the label-attaching means (LAM) 211 comprises T-shaped rails 245 that are positioned atop the body 213 of the LAM 211. A corresponding pair of clamping members 217/219 engage the corresponding T-shaped rails 245 to form "half a bearing" for the upper bar 203 of the blister hook. With the clamping members 217/219 in contact with one side of the bar 203, a separate locking piece 279 is then placed into contact with the other side of the bar 203 and then snap-locked into the clamping members 217/219. Thus, it is clear that there is no pliable sleeve *formed on the suspension device*, as specified in Claim 29 of the present application:

An adapter for attaching an electronic shelf label to a blister hook, said adapter comprising: a housing into which the shelf label is insertable or is inserted, and a suspension device for the pivotal mounting of the housing on a cross-strut provided on the free end of a cantilever of the blister hook, wherein said suspension device is a yoke that is connected to the housing

and has formed thereon at least one pliable sleeve which in open condition has a free end that is adapted to be placed around the cross-strut and to be snap-locked closed on itself.

The only portion of the Norolof device that is formed on the housing 211 are the T-shaped rails

245. Any analogous “sleeve” is only formed by the attachment of (1) the clamping members 217/219 to the T-shaped rails and then (2) the snap-locking of the locking piece 279 onto the clamping members 217/219.

In addition, the Examiner asserts that the Norolof invention includes a fork yoke in that the sidewalls of the LAM body 213 form the yoke prongs. However, it is clear that there is no yoke in Norolof where prongs are formed by the sidewalls of the LAM housing body 213¹. In particular, the sidewalls of the LAM 211 do not form a “suspension device for the pivotal mounting of the housing on a cross-strut...” Fig. 7c shows that the sidewalls of 211 have no function for suspending the LAM body 213 on the cantilever 203. As discussed previously, all of the structure that is involved for suspending the LAM body 213 is located on the top surface of the LAM body 213. No portion of the sidewalls has any means for, or contributes, to accomplishing the suspension.

Thus, for all of the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that that Claim 29 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 30-35 ultimately depend from Claim 29 and are patentable for the same reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objects to 36-40 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but acknowledges that claims 36-40 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner’s reason for allowing

¹ In addition, even if the sidewalls were to be considered yoke prongs, they are not connected to the housing, as specified in Claim 29; rather the sidewalls of Norolof form the housing.

the subject matter of claims 36-40 is that the prior art does not teach a mushroom-shaped bearing trunnion on the inner side of the prongs.

While agreeing that the prior art does not teach or suggest the claimed adapter comprising a yoke constructed in the manner of a fork having prongs wherein each of the prongs has a mushroom-shaped bearing trunnion on its inner side, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's objection to claims 36-40 be withdrawn, considering Applicants' remarks set forth above with respect to the Examiner's §102(b) rejection of Claim 29, from which claims 36-40 indirectly depend.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the above identified application, including claims 29-42, is in a condition for allowance. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejections and objections to the claims, and a Notice of Allowance, are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

CAESAR, RIVISE, BERNSTEIN,
COHEN & POKOTILOW, LTD.

By


Scott M. Slomowitz

Registration No. 39,032

Customer No. 03000

(215) 567-2010

Attorneys for Applicants

September 10, 2008

Please charge or credit our
Account No. 03-0075 as necessary
to affect entry and/or ensure
consideration of this submission.